



Kathleen King named to head Nursing School

Professor M. Kathleen King, associate director of the School of Nursing, University of Toronto, since 1965, has been appointed to succeed Miss H. M. Carpenter as director of the School when she completes a second five-year term on June 30, Dr. John Hamilton, Vice-President, Health Sciences, has announced. Miss Carpenter will continue as a professor in the School after a sabbatical.

Miss King was born in Milton, Ont., on June 30, 1925, and attended Galt Collegiate Institute before enrolling in the University of Toronto. She gained her B.A. in 1947 and her B.Sc.N. in the School of Nursing in 1951, and then joined Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital as general staff nurse instructor.

In 1954 Miss King joined the U of T School of Nursing as an assistant professor. She gained her M.S.N. from Yale University in 1959 and was made associate professor in 1963 and two years later was appointed professor. She was at the same time made associate director with particular responsibility for the administration of the B.Sc.N. courses and for relationships with all hospital clinical fields.

Among her many committee activities,



she was staff representative to the Senate, 1962-69, and a member of the Vice-presidential Interim Advisory Committee on Health Sciences from 1970 onwards. She has been a member of the Health Sciences Instructional Media Committee since 1970, member of the Advisory Committee of the Nursing Department of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, and member, then vice-chairman and, finally, chairman, Canadian Red Cross Society Ontario Division committee on nursing and a member of the executive committee of that organization.

How Dr J R Evans sees the U of T and Wright Commission report from his present vantage point

Dr. John R. Evans, President-designate of the University of Toronto, addressed the Empire Club of Toronto yesterday on "The Universities: who guides their response to changing needs?"

Dr. Evans discussed two themes of the Wright report — accountability and participation — that "have special relevance to the future of universities in this province" and suggested possible implications for the University of Toronto "as seen from a distance of 40 miles", where he is Vice-President Academic (Health Sciences) at McMaster University.

The President-designate spoke as follows to the Empire Club:

It was with reluctance that I accepted the kind invitation of your president to speak about university education. My background has been primarily in the health sciences; as far as the problems of universities are concerned I am a novice, and to the University of Toronto I am just a dark cloud on the horizon forty miles away, which will not cast its shadow directly on the University until July 1. Although there are still a few months to go before I accept these new responsibilities, I am attempting to comprehend what constitutes the University of Toronto, and also to envisage the new governing structure which will come into effect in July 1972 under the revised University of Toronto Act. You will notice that these two matters — the nature of the University of Toronto and its new governing structure — form an obligation to my treatment of the subject. "The Universities: who guides their response to changing needs?"

The changing needs to which the universities and other bodies must respond have been examined in depth over the past 18 months by the Commission on

Post-Secondary Education in Ontario. Their draft report, otherwise known as the Wright Report, has been much in the news. The draft report seems to have run into rough weather here, in Hamilton and, I believe, elsewhere in the province. The main criticisms that have been reported in the press have come from university people, both staff and students, and the burden of them has been that the Commission has made unsatisfactory provisions for student aid, university financing and relations with government. There is also a general complaint that the Commission has ignored the quality of educational experiences and the need to strive for excellence.

We should not permit these unacceptable features of the draft report (some of which may be modified) to blind us to the importance of the document as a whole. It is definitely a milestone in the educational history of this province. The Commission went the rounds of open hearings in all parts of Ontario and received a clear message that the citizens of Ontario attach great importance to post-secondary education and want wider opportunities to be available. The report strives to open up such opportunities for people in all walks of life, in all parts of the province, in all age groups. It broadens the concept of post-secondary education to include the agencies of informal education, like galleries, museums and public libraries, as well as the formal institutions, the colleges of applied arts and technology and the universities. It stresses the importance of the individual and of human values and the need for having educational processes take place on a human scale, that is, in groups small enough for

(See page 3, col. 1)

Library Science and Social Work faculty status approved by Senate

Summary of the Senate minutes, March 10, 1972:

The Senate approved a recommendation from the Executive Committee that approval in principle be given to the Report of the Heyworth Committee on Stack Access to the John P. Robarts Library, that there be different degrees of access to the library stacks by different users.

The Senate received letters of appreciation for its expression of sympathy from members of the family of the late Miss D. Milner. The Senate also received a number of letters concerning access to the stacks of the John P. Robarts Library.

The Senate approved a Report of the Committee on Scholarships and Other Awards, recommending five new awards,

amendments to six existing awards, and the termination of four awards.

The Senate approved a report from the Committee on University Ceremonials recommending that extension students at Scarborough and Erindale Colleges be permitted to graduate with the full-time students of the two colleges.

The Senate approved a statute respecting the change in name of the School of Social Work to Faculty of Social Work.

The Senate approved a statute respecting the change in name of the School of Library Science to Faculty of Library Science.

The Senate approved a statute respecting the establishment of a Certificate Program in Advanced Studies of Early Childhood and Family.

Presidential committee to study future of the School of Hygiene

Acting President John H. Sword has established a Presidential Advisory Committee on the Future Development of the School of Hygiene.

Members of the committee are:

Dean Gordon Nikiforuk, chairman; Prof. Donald A. Chant, Prof. George Connell, Dean John H. G. Crispo, Dr. John D. Hamilton, J. T. Law, Prof. R. W. Morgan, Dean A. E. Safarian, Dr. Gordon Martin, and Dr. H. Moghadam.

The specific terms of reference are: (1) to examine the structure and relationships of the School of Hygiene and its programs in the light of the professional objectives in Public Health, and (2) to make recommendations regarding the future development of the School to meet the needs of the public health professions, particularly in Ontario.

The committee will welcome comments, criticisms and memoranda, which should be addressed to Dr. Gordon Nikiforuk, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Toronto.

Meetings of the committee, which will be open, are to be held on Wednesdays at 1.30 p.m. in the library of the McMurrich (Anatomy) Building.

Volunteer help needed

World University Service of Canada needs volunteers at Emmanuel College, checkpoint for Miles for Millions Walk, Toronto project, on Saturday, May 6.

The WUSC share of the walk revenue goes towards projects in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

If you can volunteer for two hours between 10 a.m. and 10 p.m., please call 363-3481 or write WUSC, 328 Adelaide St. W. Toronto 183.

APRIL 19 DEADLINE

Our next editorial deadline is noon, Wednesday, April 19. Material should be sent or delivered to the editor, Mrs. Winogone Ferguson, 225 Simcoe Hall (928-2102).

Prof S M Uzumeri is elected to head UTFA by acclamation

Election by acclamation of Prof. S. M. Uzumeri, Civil Engineering, as President of the U of T Faculty Association was announced by the secretary, Prof. J. S. Wood, at the association's annual meeting in the Medical Sciences Auditorium April 10. He succeeds Prof. J. B. Conacher.

The following report was made on elections to the UTFA Council:

(a) Re-elected for a three-year term: R. J. K. Barker (Architecture); E. P. Downton (Dentistry); A. Kruger (Political Economy); G. R. Thaler (Erindale).

(b) New members: A. P. Ruderman (Hygiene); Miss R. Cunningham (Nursing); M. G. Finlayson (History); L. Zakuta (Sociology); F. A. DeLory (Applied Science and Engineering).

Vacancies in Pharmacy and Food Sciences have not been filled.

Membership down slightly

Prof. Wood noted that between June 30, 1971, and March 31, 1972, membership declined from 1658 to 1492. Withdrawal of OISE's 97 members was the principal factor involved.

Reporting as chairman of the University Government Committee, Prof. R. M. H. Shepherd noted that the committee's proposal concerning constituencies for election to the Governing Council was adopted, but expressed disappointment that seven of the twelve seats were filled by acclamation.

The Treasurer's report was presented by Prof. P. L. Mathews and the Griev-

ance Committee report by Prof. Frank Iacobucci who said that an amended set of guidelines for the committee's operation had been forwarded to the Acting President for comment.

Report on salaries

Reporting for the Salary and Benefits Committee, Prof. M. G. Finlayson referred to next year's salary increases of not less than 3 per cent, but in no department or division averaging more than 5.75 per cent, and commented, "The only University faculty in the province that have thus far been treated as badly as we, have been our colleagues at Laurentian".

Prof. Finlayson noted that the University had increased its contribution to life assurance and had improved the benefits for those on pension.

"It is our hope," he said, "that the budget-makers at Simcoe Hall will agree that a first charge on the budget ought to be a sum of money sufficient to provide average increases for continuing

(See page 2, col. 1)

Go easy on water

J. T. Turner, Director, Physical Plant Department, has issued the following notice:

"In an effort to assist the Metropolitan Department of Public Works during their period of labour difficulties in maintaining normal water supply to the Campus, all users are urged to minimize water consumption wherever possible."

Prof S M Uzumeri is elected to head UTFA by acclamation

(Continued from page 1)

faculty that would move them from a base of Assistant Professor to an agreed ceiling - e.g., between 2 and 2.5 times that base, over a period of time that we would hope to agree upon - e.g., 20 years."

The committee, he declared, was still active on three issues:

(1) devising a formula for generation of a fund sufficient to finance progress through the ranks;

(2) developing suggested salary negotiating procedures under the new Governing Council;

(3) considering the issues involved in the event of a future trade-off of higher salaries and a changed faculty-student ratio.

The retiring President's report

Prof. Conacher's report for 1971-72 follows:

As you know, I am the first President of the Association to assume the office on a half-time teaching basis. That is to say, I have been paid by the University to spend half my time on UTFA business. I may say that I do not know how my predecessors managed otherwise, although I should add that because of the allowed time I assumed extra responsibilities sitting on most committees and looking after correspondence and minutes and drafting of various reports that might have been done by others.

I do not think that I need to report on the activities of the year at great length since to a certain extent I have already done this in circular letters sent out in the course of the year. Moreover much of our work has been done in standing committees and will be reported on by committee chairmen.

A great deal of our time this year has been spent in considering and responding to various reports or proposals sent to us for consideration. The first of these was the draft University Act, about which we reported fully in September. The next was the Crispo Report on Supplementary Income, on which we reported to the special general meeting in October and subsequently in the January Newsletter. Although most of our proposals have been adopted by the President's Council, the Report has not yet been approved owing to the failure of the President's Council to date to work out some implementation clauses.

Next we considered the proposed new by-laws for the CAUT and, as I reported in my January newsletter, succeeded in persuading the CAUT to accept a number of important amendments that we had worked out. The new constitution of the CAUT will come into effect this summer.

The next report we considered was that of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Social Responsibilities. The Council was highly critical of this interim report and set up a committee to respond to it, but on the announcement of the resignation of the Social Responsibilities Committee our committee ceased to function.

The next challenge came in the form of the Wright Report on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario. On receipt of this Report the executive set up an ad hoc committee under my chairmanship, consisting of Professors W. Dunphy, (Phil.S.M.), M. G. Finlayson (History), A. Kruger (Pol.Econ.), R. Shepherd (Classics, U.C.), H. Smith (Electrical Eng.), and R. Williams (Biochemistry) to prepare a UTFA brief. The time was very short, since we decided to present our brief to the first of two scheduled Toronto meetings of the Commission on 28 February. We did make an interim report to the Council, which authorized us to complete the brief along the lines indicated and present it on behalf of the Association. We did this on 28 February and was well received but unfortunately the discussion was cut off prematurely. The brief, which has been circulated to the membership, suffered from being prepared in a great rush, but my main regret is that there were no women members on the committee. In addition, as you know, we participated in a Uni-

versity discussion of the report under the auspices of a faculty-student committee chaired by the Acting President. As a faculty contribution we organized a very well attended debate in the Medical Sciences Building Auditorium between two faculty spokesmen, Principal John Robson and Professor Arthur Kruger, and two members of the Commission, Drs. Reva Gerstein and Douglas Wright. This was followed up on March 7 by an administration, faculty, student panel discussion in which we were represented by Professors Dunphy, Finlayson and Shepherd.

Finally I should report on the UTFA response to the Robarts Library crisis. On Saturday 11 March, I was summoned to the President's office to what turned out to be a non-meeting in the Medical Building arising from the student occupation of the Senate chamber the night before. Professor Schabas called me on Sunday and suggested the calling of a meeting of Council. The matter first came to the attention of the UTFA executive at an emergency executive committee meeting on Monday, 13 March at which it was decided to call a Council meeting for the following Monday, 20 March. At this time we were doubtful that the Faculty Association had a role to play. Following the Acting President's surprising concessions to the students responsible for the renewed sit-in we held a second executive on the 14th and prepared a statement critical of the Acting President's action which was presented to the President's Council that afternoon by Professors Shepherd and Uzumeri and again at the special meeting of faculty called by the Acting President on 17 March. At the UTFA Council meeting on 20 March we had a long discussion of the whole issue and prepared a longer statement for presentation to the Senate meeting that evening, urging the immediate endorsement of Part I of the Heyworth Report and the referral of the remaining parts back to the Library Council with instructions to settle the matter of stack access on demonstrated need. This resolution, which was subsequently presented in the University of Toronto *Bulletin* of 30 March was read to the Senate at my request by Professor Howard Rapson. It corresponded very closely with the amending resolution proposed by Principal Robson which was carried and which led apparently to a final solution of the crisis.

In conclusion, I regret to say that in my opinion relations with the central administration of the University have deteriorated in the course of this year. It is true that the administration has supported UTFA by carrying half the president's salary, that our advice on the matter of faculty elections to the Governing Council has been accepted, and that the Central Budget Committee and the Vice President Non-Academic have been prepared to discuss salary and other benefits with the Association (in the matter of other benefits with good effect). The salary discussions, however, as the Chairman of the Salary and Benefits Committee will report, were less satisfactory and we were dismayed that the Acting President chose to announce the new salary scales to the press rather than to the faculty as has been done in the past. In other matters, Simcoe Hall has appeared to be uninterested in faculty opinion or faculty views whether expressed by the Faculty Association or faculty elected members of the President's Council. One example of this was to be seen in the way in which the Acting President rejected advice both of the Association and more seriously of his elected faculty advisers in setting up the search committee to name a Dean of Arts and Science in contrast with the way in which he accepted student nominations to the same committee. Likewise, on the question of access to the stacks of the Robarts Library, the administration showed a greater readiness to respond to radical student pressure than to that of faculty advisers. Fortunately in this case the Senate restored a sense of proportion, and I note that in the recent SAC elec-

tions the students themselves have decisively rejected the tactics of confrontation to which the administration was inclined to submit.

It may be, however, that the most serious case of the Acting President failing to heed or even to ask for faculty opinion is in the implementation of the Land Report on instructional media, which proposes to vest in the University all copyright in audio-visual materials that are developed by faculty members using University facilities. This is a very complicated matter but it does affect the potential rights of all faculty members. Nevertheless without consulting the President's Council or the Faculty Association, the Acting President obtained the Board of Governors' approval in January of a form of contract vesting all copyright in the University. At a meeting on Friday UTFA Council unanimously condemned this action in a resolution which will be circulated to members of the Association and urged them not to sign the present form of contract.

If it is the wish of the meeting I would be glad to propose a further discussion of this question after we have completed our other business.

I make these remarks with great reluctance because we all know the difficulties under which the Acting President has been working this year. Nevertheless, one is forced to conclude that the faculty voice has been ignored and the activist student voice has been listened to because the administration has been afraid of the latter while confident that the faculty will not make trouble. I am not suggesting that we should adopt a line of militant confrontation, but I am saying publicly that these developments have had a serious effect on faculty morale and to my knowledge have led some members of faculty to question whether they want to remain at the University of Toronto. In a few months a new President and a new Governing Council will take over responsibility for the University and it is well that they should be aware of this situation.

COMING EVENTS

APRIL

14 FRIDAY

Lectures

Chemistry

"Complexes of Macrocyclic Ligands". Prof. Daryl Busch, Evans Chemical Laboratory, The Ohio State University. Room 158 Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories. 2.30 p.m. (SGS and Chemistry)

Classics

"Plague and Diseases at Rome". Sir Ronald Syme, Department of Classics, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario. Room 103 University College. 4-6 p.m. (SGS and Classics)

Library Science

Third Bertha Bassam Lecture in Librarianship "Current International Trends in Librarianship and Library Education". Principal Frank N. Hogg, College of Librarianship, Wales. Lecture Hall, Library Science, 140 St. George St. 8.15 p.m. (Alumni Association, Library Science)

17 MONDAY

Lectures

Aerospace

"A Theory of 'Excess' Noise In Subsonic Jets Associated with Jet-Pipe Interaction". Dr. David Crighton, Department of Mathematics, Imperial College, England. Main Lecture Hall, UTIAS. 1.30 p.m. (SGS and Aerospace Studies)

Engineering

"Properties of Amorphous Materials". Prof. Helmutt Fritzsche, Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Illinois. Room G-248 Galbraith Building. 3 p.m. (SGS and Electrical Engineering)

Chemistry

"Diradicals: Phenomena or Ephemera"? Prof. R. G. Bergman, Div. of Chemistry & Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology. Room 158 Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories. 4 p.m. (SGS and Chemistry)

18 TUESDAY

Colloquium

Computer

"A Mathematical Approach to Computer Language Semantics". Prof. Dana Scott, Princeton University. 103 McLennan Physical Laboratories. 3.45 p.m. (Computer Science)

19 WEDNESDAY

Film

Documentary film on the English painter Duncan Grant and The Bloomsbury Group, of which he was a member. Included will be his reminiscences of Virginia Woolf, Lytton Strachey, and others. The film was made at Charleston, Sussex, where various members of the Group lived and painted. Free. 104 UC. 4 p.m. (English, UC)

20 THURSDAY

Lectures

Environmental

"A Study of Factors Affecting Water Use in Metropolitan Toronto". Prof. L. E. Jones. Room 211 Haultain Building. 4 p.m. (Institute of Environmental Science and Engineering)

Man In Nature

"The Ancient Maya: Life and Death of a Jungle Civilization". Dr. D. Pendergast. Museum Theatre, ROM. 8.30 p.m.

Seminar

Materials

"Application of Levitation Melting to the Study of Steel-Making Reactions". Prof. A. McLean. 116 Wallberg Building. 4 p.m. (Materials Research Centre)

21 FRIDAY

Lecture

Medicine

"Present Concepts of the Mode of Action of Neuromuscular Blocking Agents". Prof. Francis F. Foldes, Professor of Anesthesiology, Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Chief, Department of Anesthesiology, Montefiore Hospital and Medical Center, N.Y. Large Lecture Theatre, Toronto General Hospital. 4 p.m. (The Doctor Murray Mendelson Memorial Lecture for 1972)

Seminar

Hygiene

"A Re-examination of Infant Feeding Practices". Dr. Helen A. Guthrie, Associate Professor Foods and Nutrition, College of Human Development, Pennsylvania State University. Room 235 School of Hygiene. 2 p.m. (SGS and Hygiene)

Supper

5.30-6 p.m. Reception. 6-8.30 p.m. Buffet. Faculty Club.

24 MONDAY

Seminar

Waves Sciences

"Harmonic Generation of Surface Acoustic Waves". Prof. Eric L. Adler, McGill University. 119 Galbraith Building. 3 p.m. (Electrical Engineering)

27 THURSDAY

Lecture

Medicine

"Chemical Basis for Induction and Suppression of Experimental Allergic Encephalomyelitis". Dr. E. M. Eylar, Merck Institute for Therapeutic Research, Rahway, N.J. 3153 Medical Sciences Building. 4 p.m. (SGS and Biochemistry)

28 FRIDAY

Seminar

Medicine

"Some Aspects of Glycoprotein Biosynthesis". Dr. E. M. Eylar. 5227 Medical Sciences Building. 11 a.m. (SGS and Biochemistry)

MAY

4 THURSDAY

Tea

Spring tea at home of Acting President and Mrs. John Sword, 93 Highland Ave. 1.30 to 4.30 p.m. Fashions by Olga Fowler Gowns and hats by Peggy Claire of Harridge's. Donations in aid of Camp Boulderwood. (Women's Auxiliary of University Settlement)

Seminar

Materials

"High-Temperature Eutectic Alloys". Prof. G. C. Weatherly. 116 Wallberg Building. 4 p.m. (Materials Research Centre)

How Dr Evans sees the U of T and the Wright Report

(Continued from page 1)

the individual to feel that his voice is heard and his contribution is noted.

The report attacks head-on a great many of the ideas about the learning process that have become hardened by usage and sanctified by identification with academic standards. I have no intention of making light of academic standards. But I do not think they can be equated with old-style sequences of learning where Arts 100 is a compulsory prerequisite for Arts 200. While the sequential building block pattern of learning may be appropriate for some students in certain disciplines, others will do better with a problem-solving approach, or even more unorthodox methods which integrate learning and life experience. Since the objectives of educational programs are different and the factors which motivate students vary greatly, one must question slavish adherence to any single approach to education. It is important that we judge the value of the educational experience by the outcome rather than by the process followed.

The Wright Report envisages three routes to educational and professional qualifications. Besides the ordinary progression from high school to university, there would be a route through the colleges of applied arts and technology by means of more flexible arrangements for transfer from para-professional and technological programs to professional ones. The third route would involve the recognition of units of work experience as partial qualification for professional status. The report also recommends that periodic study leave to enable a person to keep up-to-date with changes in his field should be the rule wherever possible. In these and other respects the Wright Commission has shown its agreement with some of the ideas in a comprehensive brief which it received and which since has been published by McClelland and Stewart under the title *Towards 2000*. As one of the co-authors, I confidently recommend *Towards 2000* to you as a book of unusual wisdom and perception with unrivalled clarity of expression! If Jack McClelland is here, he will probably confirm that books like ours are in large measure responsible for the decline of the Canadian publishing industry. Unless he can arrange to have it replace the Gideon Bible in hotel rooms it is unlikely that any of its authors will receive royalties.

Two themes of the Wright Report which have special relevance to the future of universities in this Province are accountability and participation. I shall comment in general on both themes and suggest possible implications for the University of Toronto as seen from a distance of forty miles.

Accountability

In the fiscal sense accountability means that recipients of public funds must satisfy the public that the funds have actually been spent for the purpose for which they were voted. There is no conceivable quarrel with this requirement and I understand, for example, that the financial statements and auditors' reports of the University of Toronto have been tabled in the Legislature of Ontario since before 1906. Moreover, the operations underlying those financial reports, such as the reporting of enrolments which determine by formula the operating grants, and the classification of capital needs and entitlements, have taken place for some time under microscopic governmental scrutiny.

The Wright Report, however, in its treatment of public accountability asks for more than validation of the financial affairs of the University. Specifically, it says: "Considerations of public accountability require that government be assured that public funds for post-secondary education are being spent efficiently and effectively." There is no quarrel with efficiency and effectiveness as such: those goals are cherished by all administrators. But the proving of our efficiency and effectiveness involves our being accountable to a government department for academic as well as financial practices. Much depends on the monitoring mechanisms the government creates. They

may be Parkinsonian. Already man-years of high-level brain-power and the efforts of an army of clerical staff are expended annually on the filling out of forms and the answering of questionnaires for the government bureaucracy. I am told, for instance, that at the University of Toronto the reporting to government of the number of students that are registered in the various courses and divisions on one particular date in December each year requires the filling out of 1100 separate government forms! An even more unpalatable possibility is that the government's mechanisms will be so detailed and their rules, procedures and categories so rigid that innovation in academic programs will be inhibited and we shall be unable to respond effectively to the changing needs of the society we serve.

Setting aside these universal complaints, however, if we face squarely the subject of accountability of universities for their subsidy from public funds, we must feel compelled to justify our existence, our method of operation, in comparison with any other means that have been or may be thought of for producing the same results. Here we are handicapped by the difficulty of measurement. It is not enough to count the number of students "processed" and the percentage of examinations passed. We must also develop measures of the quality and depth of the individual student's experience and the benefit which society may expect from the investment. Our subjective impressions relate primarily to what we have believed to be valid in the past but in an era of change we cannot be sure that this validity carries forward.

Accountability, then, involves justification of formal post-secondary education in comparison with other alternatives. The Wright Report lays great stress upon alternatives for young people who do not readily find themselves a place in today's labour market, and it mentions some of these alternatives in its first recommendation: Canadian University Service Overseas, Frontier College and Opportunities for Youth. We might add Winter Works and Local Initiative Programs. I respect the need for alternatives, with the corollary of greater choice and greater range of life styles for the young people involved. At the same time when considering accountability and justification, it is necessary to point out that the costs of the alternatives may be equal to or far greater than the costs of formal education and there is no evidence yet that the benefits either to the individual or to society, particularly the longer range benefits, can match those conferred by formal education.

The latest annual report of the Carnegie Corporation deals with this same issue in the United States and strikes a note of caution. Mr. Pifer, President of Carnegie, comments:

"Moreover, there is the question of cost, a question which those who express concern over the tax burden of higher education would do well to remember. While the average annual real cost of having a student in college at the undergraduate level, including educational and general costs and board and lodging, is not more than \$4,000 (perhaps \$6,000 if foregone earnings are included), the cost of having the same person serve as a recruit in military service is \$7,500, as a Peace Corps volunteer nearly \$10,000, and as a VISTA volunteer \$7,800. It should also be remembered that of the total annual expenditure on higher education [not all] comes from public tax sources whereas in military and other national service programs the entire burden falls on the taxpayer."

As this quotation indicates and as the Wright Commission recognizes in its second recommendation, alternatives to post-secondary education will not be cheap. The same applies to the version of the British open university which the Commission recommends. These alternatives should be explored, but they should be subjected to the same scrutiny of justification, cost effectiveness and cost benefit as the formal programs of post-secondary education.

The accountability that is required of

universities must embrace our research as well as our educational programs, and once again we are handicapped by the lack of objective means of evaluating the worth of our research efforts. One of the difficulties with evaluation of research is that the long view is essential. Fifty years ago a young physician and his student research assistant at the University of Toronto were tying off the main duct of the pancreatic gland in dogs in order to produce atrophy of that gland. A year later, insulin was at hand. About fifteen years ago a young assistant professor of economics was working on a research project in which no one else was interested, which would certainly have been called "useless". His subject was foreign control of Canadian corporations. The writings of an English professor at St. Michael's College have conditioned all of us - a whole generation - to be receptive to new ideas. How can we measure the importance of such research, and such people, in anticipating and reacting to change? This is an area where university initiative, as well as public accountability, must be very carefully safeguarded.

The interrelated problems of accountability and change lead me inevitably to the progressively tightening financial strait-jacket in which the universities find themselves at the present time. Legitimate new demands are being made on universities with increasing frequency and these new demands cannot be met without diversion of resources from existing commitments. In the 1960s the University of Toronto was able to adapt to the changing educational scene because it was in a period of growth. Now, however, its size is such that further growth is undesirable, and it has chosen voluntarily to exist in a steady state. So we are not talking about an "add-on" situation. If we add anything on we must subtract something else. Priorities must be set, and if new and important needs are to be met, low priority programs will have to be phased out with all the pain and sense of personal betrayal that that implies.

At the same time, a university cannot update its educational resources the way Eaton's and Simpson's dispose of excess inventory through a spring clearance sale. Our response to changing needs must be made having regard to the responsibilities of a corporation which is also an academic community, and with consideration of our role in relation to the other universities of the Ontario system and to the national scene.

At the University of Toronto after July 1 of this year we shall be approaching the task of setting priorities and responding to change through the mechanism of a new and unproven form of university government. The new Governing Council of the University meets the need for public accountability and at the same time provides for the internal resilience necessary to respond to change. Half of the members of the Governing Council will represent groups outside the University, being appointed by the government or else elected by the alumni. The other half will represent the students, teachers and employees of the University. Thus, although the task that lies ahead is a difficult one, we shall have a responsible body that involves all the community affected by the decisions. This experiment will have significance for other institutions in the public sector of our society, and perhaps for those in the private sector as well.

Participation

The second theme is "participation", that is, the involvement of those affected by decisions in the formulation or approval of those decisions. The Wright Commission on Post-Secondary Education puts great emphasis upon the individual man or woman, and rightly so. Depersonalization, they say, is destructive both to the individual and to society as a whole. The individual must be central and he must decide what educational experience is best for him. Increased participation of students and faculty in the decision-making bodies of existing colleges and universities is recommended. In fact, the Commission

would make it mandatory to have students and faculty on the Boards and Senates of other governing bodies of colleges and universities.

It is paradoxical, however, that in the province as a whole at the interface of colleges and universities with the provincial government, the Commission recommends tighter and completely centralized governmental controls. The universities, for example, would come under a co-ordinating board appointed by the government with powers to determine admissions policy and to establish or abolish academic programs. This scheme would remove the individual student and the individual faculty member farther away from the locus of decisions about matters which affect the individual closely. Furthermore, with such direct government control there is always the anxiety if not the danger that political accountability may become more important than public accountability. This is of special significance in Ontario where almost all post-secondary educational institutions are provincial institutions and there are, therefore, no major private or national institutions independent of the provincial government to provide a yardstick to standards or a competitive stimulus to the provincially controlled sector.

Moreover, in spite of the Commission's emphasis on the co-ordination of all educational resources, the Wright Report proposes a separate co-ordinating board for each of the three sectors of post-secondary education - one for universities, one for colleges of applied arts and technology, and one for the informal agencies of education including museums, theatres and public libraries. Then the Report virtually ensures that all these sectors will be adversaries competing with one another for government funds by recommending a Senior Advisory Committee "to advise the Minister on allocation of funds between various sectors of post-secondary education upon receipt of requests from the three co-ordinating boards".

Instead of throwing the apple of discord among the three sectors in this fashion and attempting to centralize decisions on the post-secondary educational process for a population of over eight million with diverse needs, the Commission would have done well to consider some devolution on a regional basis.

While it may be advantageous for each sector of post-secondary education to have a distinctive role, the public in a geographic area of the province is likely to be best served if the institutions and informal agencies of that region work in close collaboration to achieve effective shared use of resources, to avoid duplication of programs and to facilitate transferability of experience. Rather than the addition of further central control mechanisms, I should like to see regional boards established, each with responsibility for co-ordinating all the post-secondary educational facilities as a regional educational resource. This arrangement would give room for diversity instead of tending towards conformity as invariably results from central control. Although decentralization involving real delegation of authority is administratively less tidy, it has certain advantages. It would bring about economies through the pooling of educational resources and would furnish motivation for such pooling. It would permit more direct participation of the citizens affected by the policy decisions and programs and would make the whole system more responsive to local needs. For example, it would facilitate very different approaches in the sparsely populated areas of Northern Ontario where the great distances and the high proportion of educationally disadvantaged people require different programs from those appropriate to the semi-urbanized Southwestern areas of the province. Laurentian University has made this point with striking force.

In keeping with the growing popular desire for involvement and participation, the recent trend in Ontario has been to decentralize authority to regional and/or district levels in publicly supported services such as education, health, and hospitals, which are of direct concern to

(See page 4, col. 1)

University honours the names of Woodhouse, Haultain, MacMurray



The Board of Governors has approved a recommendation of the University Building Names committee that:

The Mill Building be renamed the Haultain Building to perpetuate the name of the late Prof. H. E. T. Haultain, head of mining engineering for 30 years;

Books on the open shelves of the Reading Room and the English Literature Reading Room in the John P. Robarts Library be called the Woodhouse Collection, in honour of the late Prof. A. S. P. Woodhouse, who had been with University College Department of English for 35 years until his retirement in 1964;

The field house on the Robert Street Playing Field be called the W. B. MacMurray Field House in honour of the Headmaster of University of Toronto Schools.

Prof. Haultain, who died in 1961 at the age of 92, was an engineer, teacher, inventor, friend and mentor of students, and the originator of the Iron Ring which engineers wear as a symbol of their profession. Prof. Haultain graduated from the School of Practical Science, predecessor of today's Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, in 1889. After three decades as head of his department, he retired as professor emeritus, after having contributed generously to the advancement of the University and the profession to which he had dedicated his life.

The idea of an iron ring as an emblem

The Board of Governors has approved the recommendation of the University's Building Names committee that: the books in the reading room and the English literature reading room of the John P. Robarts Library be called the Woodhouse Collection to commemorate the name of the late A. S. P. Woodhouse, left, for 35 years on the staff of University College English department; the Mill Building be re-named the Haultain Building to perpetuate the name of the late H. E. T. Haultain, right, inventor, professor of mining engineering for a quarter-century and originator of the engineers' Iron Ring; and the Robert Street field house bear the name of W. B. MacMurray, below, retiring headmaster of University of Toronto Schools.



of engineering came to Prof. Haultain while reading Rudyard Kipling's line, "But Iron - Cold Iron - is master of them all." He persuaded the famous author to write the ritual for a ceremony at which graduates in engineering would receive iron rings. The first such ceremony, now an annual event at this and other universities with engineering schools, was held at U of T in 1926.

Prof. Haultain was the inventor of two pieces of laboratory apparatus, the Superpanner, which separates very finely divided minerals according to their specific gravity, and the Infrasizer, which

separates extremely fine pulverized ore according to particle size. Unable to interest commercial manufacturers in producing them, he formed his own company, Infrasizers Limited, for that purpose. He subsequently turned the company over to the University, which operates it from an office in the now Haultain Building, where Prof. Haultain carried out most of his work.

One of the great scholarly authorities on the works of John Milton, A. S. P. Woodhouse headed U.C.'s Department of English from 1945 until his retirement at the end of June 1964, four



months before his death. Prof. Woodhouse took his B.A. at University of Toronto in 1919 and an A.M. at Harvard. He was one of those chiefly responsible for working out the editorial policy of the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, he was a pillar of the Humanities Research Council of Canada, and was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. Prof. Woodhouse's contributions to learning led Prof. Roy Daniells of the University of British Columbia to write that "he burnished ideas until they shone like revealed truth".

Until a few years ago, University of Toronto Schools pupils had a playing field known as Aura Lee, east of Avenue Rd. and north of Davenport Rd. Aura Lee was sold, and a more conveniently located site for a field was found on Robert St., just west of Spadina Ave. and south of Bloor. Recently the University completed the job of making the property fully useable for athletics - skating, hockey, tennis, and field games - to be enjoyed by UTS boys, other members of the University community, and, when the facility was not in U of T-UTS use, by members of the outside community.

Now the well equipped field house bears the name of Brock MacMurray, who since 1944 has been Headmaster of UTS and retires from the principalship at the end of the current school year. Mr. MacMurray, himself a graduate of UTS, earned a B.A. at U of T in 1931 and his B.Paed. degree at Ontario College of Education in 1923.

How Dr Evans sees the U of T and the Wright Report

(Continued from page 3)

the community. In the health field, with which I am most familiar, such regional planning has been taking place in the province for five years with considerable success, in achieving functional co-operation at the operating level. Area-wide patterns of co-operation of universities, colleges of applied arts and technology, teaching hospitals and health agencies, are well established in Hamilton, Kingston, London and Ottawa. The Commission seems for some reason to have overlooked this phenomenon in its survey of the province.

The Metro region represents a special problem and has come to be regarded as the exception to almost every rule in regional planning, not because its citizens have intrinsic claims to special treatment but because of the sheer size and complexity compared with any other region. It is one thing to sit down in Hamilton with representatives from Mohawk College of Applied Arts and Technology, McMaster University, and four Hamilton hospitals. It is something else again to envisage a working level exchange of information and proposals at a meeting consisting of representatives of Toronto and York Universities, Glendon, Scarborough and Erindale Colleges, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Seneca, Humber, Centennial and George Brown Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Lakeshore and Toronto

Teachers' Colleges, The Clarke Institute of Psychiatry and nine teaching hospitals affiliated with the University of Toronto, the 14 Schools of Nursing, the Royal Ontario Museum, the Metro and Toronto Library Boards, the Art Gallery of Ontario and the Ontario College of Art. The profusion of resources does not invalidate the regional approach. Indeed it reinforces the need for it but it calls for a variant of the all-inclusive regional board - perhaps functional sub-units emphasizing specific fields where the greatest benefit might be expected.

Reference to the size and complexity of Metro is a sobering reminder to me of the size and complexity of the University of Toronto itself. The University's total population including staff, students and employees is about the size of Peterborough or Guelph, and its operating budget approximates that of Goodyear Tire, Falconbridge or Cannon; it used more kilowatts of electric power last year than Owen Sound. It includes over a hundred separate administrative units - colleges, faculties, centres, institutes, departments and so on - which in tradition, in interest, in size and in geographic location are about as diverse a collection of enterprises as are imaginable with a single organizational entity. In such circumstances, there is an overwhelming urge to standardize and simplify. But at the same time, one is forced to recognize that in an institution of this size, diversity is a strength and undue centralization could undermine the objective of participation of students, faculty and

staff on a human scale which the present system of colleges etc. permits.

Participation is a major feature of the new Governing Council of the University of Toronto. This will be the first time that all the various estates of an Ontario university will have a duly constituted body in whose formation they have had a share and in whose deliberations they will have a voice. It is a courageous venture in participatory democracy, and will be a test of the responsibility of all concerned. Delay or obstruction by any special interest group could cause the governing process to grind to a halt; there is obviously a need for enormous good will, intelligence, and dedication to the institution and the community it serves. It will be essential to avoid subverting the decisions of the Governing Council by reacting to pressures brought to bear outside the governing structure. On the other hand, if the duly constituted body is not responsive to changing needs, it will become obsolete in short order. It cannot be used as an agent to preserve the *status quo*.

In this new development in university government it is appropriate for the University of Toronto to pioneer. Those of us working in other institutions in the province recognize the leadership given by the University of Toronto in introducing greater flexibility into its admission requirements and its teaching programs. Among the schools of the province it has the reputation of having tough standards, and yet the number of confirmed applications for freshman ad-

mission, as of this date, is up by more than a thousand over last year - this at a time when many institutions are short of students. Now it is about to embark upon another pioneering experiment - the new scheme of university governance that I have described.

This experiment has relevance, I suggest, far beyond the academic world. The ground-swell of participatory democracy, and the inevitability of change, are two factors that are not confined to educational institutions. They impinge on the affairs of practically every organization in today's society. There is "people involvement" in municipal affairs, in political parties, in professional associations, even in business and industry where the board-room decisions taken behind closed doors are no longer immune from challenge. With change as the order of the day, the response to change and the setting of new priorities have to be reached through wider consultation with those affected; and the indices of success are not simple ones. This is why I believe the experiment at the University of Toronto has wide implications. I hope for your interest, understanding and support.

Geography, not Engineering

John Helliwell, vice-president elect of the Students' Administrative Council, was described in the April 6 *Bulletin* as a fourth year student in Civil Engineering. He is in fact in fourth year Geography at Innis College.